2 3 4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 5 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA** 6 7 TIAWNA FINCH, Case No. 2:21-cv-00669-RFB-NJK 8 Plaintiff(s), **Order** 9 v. [Docket No. 18] 10 M1 SUPPORT SERVICES, L.P., 11 Defendant(s). 12 Pending before the Court is a stipulation to extend the discovery cutoff by 60 days. Docket No. 18. A request to extend unexpired deadlines in the scheduling order must be premised on a 14 showing of good cause. Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4); Local Rule 26-3. The good cause analysis turns 15 on whether the subject deadlines cannot reasonably be met despite the exercise of diligence. Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992). The instant stipulation 17 is premised on difficulties in scheduling Plaintiff's deposition. Docket No. 18 at 3. Other than 18 referring in general terms to "significant calendar conflicts," no details are provided. Indeed, no explanation has been provided as to why this deposition cannot be scheduled within the more than 20 two weeks in the current discovery period, cf. Charm Floral v. Wald Imports, Ltd., 2012 U.S. Dist. 21 Lexis 16007, at *6-7 (W.D. Wash. Feb. 9, 2012) (collecting cases that "more than one week's notice generally is considered reasonable" for depositions), let alone why an additional two months 23 would be required to schedule this deposition. 24 Accordingly, the stipulation for extension is DENIED without prejudice. 25 IT IS SO ORDERED. 26 Dated: October 29, 2021 27 Nancy J. Koppe 28 United States Magistrate Judge